REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 14, and 22-28 are now present in this application. Claims 1 and 10 are independent.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Request for Entry of Response After Final Rejection

This response should be entered after final rejection because no claim amendments are submitted that would require further search. Instead, Applicants request reconsideration of rejections under Section 112, first paragraph, and Section 103, in view of the Applicants further remarks.

In the event that this response does not place this application into condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to enter this response because it places the application into better condition for appeal.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

Information Disclosure Citation

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the reference supplied with the Information Disclosure Statement filed 6/14/2006, and for providing Applicants with an initialed copy of the PTO-SB08 form filed therewith.

Drawings

Since no objection has been received, Applicants assume that the drawings are acceptable and that no further action is necessary. Confirmation thereof in the next Office Action is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph, as lacking a written description in the specification. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges that the disclosure at page 13, lines 12-14, of the present specification does not disclose the subject matter in lines 13-19 of amended claim 10, recited as "data conversion unit covering said synthesized three-dimensional image data, using a subset of the three-dimensional display control information for said plurality of types of three-dimensional display schemes, into a format of a selected three-dimensional display scheme of said plurality of three-dimensional display schemes."

In other words, the Examiner alleges that the subject matter added in the amendment of February 2, 2010 in claim 10 is new matter.

Claim 10 had been amended to clarify an implicit relationship between features of the multimedia information generation apparatus and features of the multimedia information reproduction apparatus. Claim 10 recites features of the multimedia information generation apparatus including "said three-dimensional image display control information supporting a plurality of three-dimensional display schemes." Applicants note that the claimed control information supporting a plurality of three-dimensional display schemes is the control information that is provided to the multimedia information reproduction apparatus. Because the multimedia information reproduction apparatus performs reproduction in accordance with one display scheme, a subset of the three-dimensional display control information is used by the data conversion unit of the multimedia information reproduction apparatus.

Subsequently, the amendment to recite "using a subset of the three-dimensional display control information..." was made because the claimed "display control information supporting a plurality of three-dimensional display schemes" (for the generation apparatus) implied that only a subset of the display control information is used for a single display scheme (for the reproduction apparatus). The claim amendment made this implied relationship explicit.

The amendment has a basis in the three-dimensional display control information as shown, for example, in Fig. 4A. As disclosed throughout the present specification, the three-dimensional display control information of the present invention provides control information for several three-dimensional display schemes. For example, the control information "direction of thinning" and

"parallax image switching pitch" are used by the parallax barrier scheme. The control information "parallax amount shift limit" is used by display schemes that use binocular parallax (examples shown in Figs. 41, 42A and 42B).

This three-dimensional image display control information provided for a plurality of display schemes (Fig. 4A) is analyzed (i.e., obtain a subset of the control information) for use with a particular display scheme of the multimedia information reproduction apparatus (e.g., Fig. 27). In an example embodiment as shown in Fig. 27, a control information analysis unit 52 selects three-dimensional display control information based on the type of three-dimensional display scheme. Fig. 27, for example, shows a dotted line from control information analysis unit 52 to data conversion unit 26 and display unit 44.

In particular, the claimed data conversion unit is based on the data conversion unit 26 as disclosed in several example embodiments. According to the specification at page 13 (which is cited by the Examiner), file structure analysis unit 21 identifies each of header control information, three-dimensional image data and three-dimensional display control information of the input multimedia information file, and provides the three-dimensional display control information to three-dimensional display control information analysis unit 25 (similar in function to the control information analysis unit 52 of Fig. 27 with respect to control information that it provides to data conversion unit 26). Three-dimensional display control information analysis unit 25 analyzes the three-dimensional display control information and provides information derived therefrom to data conversion unit 26. Data conversion unit 26 converts the decoded three-dimensional image data to allow the data to conform to a desired three-dimensional display form, and outputs the converted data display unit 24.

Because the data conversion unit 26 is provided information derived from three-dimensional display control information in multimedia information, which is disclosed as having control information for a plurality of display schemes, it is implied that the data conversion unit uses a subset of the three-dimensional display control information for converting three-dimensional image data into a format of a selected three-dimensional display scheme.

Applicants believe that this explanation is sufficient to show that the claim amendment is based on the specification as filed, and is not new matter.

Accordingly, Applicants request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,023,277 (Osaka) in view of U.S. Patent 6,313,866 (Akamatsu). Further, claims 14 and 22-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Osaka in view of U.S. Patent 6,657,655 (Iizuka). As has been previously pointed out, **the rejection of claim 14 is improper**, at least because claim 14 depends from claim 1. A proper rejection of claim 14 must include Akamatsu, as Akamatsu is cited in the rejection of claim 1. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

The Examiner presents some further arguments with respect to claim 1, in a section "Response to Arguments" at page 13 of the Office Action. In the last filed response, Applicants had argued that Akamatsu does not teach different three-dimensional display schemes. However, the Examiner presents a further argument that the "parallax control circuit" and "depth information limiter" applied to the two three-dimensional image signals "1" and "2", as illustrated in Figs. 4 and 5 of Akamatsu, are clearly two separate display schemes because the display scheme utilizing the "parallax control circuit" of Fig. 4 enables one image to be displayed in front of the other three-dimensional image with excellent quality, while the display scheme of Fig. 5 limits the range of image signal output to the three-dimensional image synthesizer.

Applicants submit that even if it could be said that the arrangements in Figs. 4 and 5 are directed to different display schemes, claim 1 is directed to a multimedia information generating apparatus having a control information generation unit generating three-dimensional image display control information for a plurality of three-dimensional display schemes.

In other words, at most the apparatus in Fig. 4 generates display control information for one display scheme, and the apparatus in Fig. 5 generates display control information for another display scheme. As pointed out by the Examiner, the embodiment in Fig. 4 and the embodiment in Fig. 5 are "separate." The claimed apparatus does not constitute separate apparatuses. Instead, the claimed apparatus generates control information for a plurality of display schemes.

Applicants submit that the Examiner's reasoning is unreasonable. In particular, Applicants submit that it is unreasonable to rely on Akamatsu for allegedly teaching the generation of control information for a plurality of display schemes. The claim recites a "control information generation unit" Akamatsu does not at least disclose the claimed "control information generation unit."

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert W. Downs, Registration No. 48222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: August 31, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Robt Downs #48222
Charles Gorenstein Robert Downs
Registration No.: 29271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
703-205-8000